

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because the status of the co-pending application on page 1 required updating. The specification has been amended to include the serial number of the co-pending application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 8, 10 – 13, 18 – 31, 34 – 41, 43 – 48, 51 – 57, and 59 – 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Luciani (US 6,331,984). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant's exemplary independent claim 1 sets forth:

“A method of translating addresses in a communication network having multiple overlapping address domains, the method comprising the steps of:  
receiving an overlapping local address from an inbound address domain; and  
translating the overlapping local address from the inbound address domain into a unique global address that is specific to a specified outbound address domain.”

In contrast, the portions of Luciani referenced by the Office Action describe a classic NAT system. Packets leaving the local domain are assigned a global address. The global address of Luciani is not specific to a specified outbound address domain, as the Applicant has claimed. In fact, the global addresses as described in Luciani are independent of outbound address domains.

Luciani therefore fails to teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention. The Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 3, 6 – 8, 10 – 13, and 18 – 21 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicant's independent Claim 22 sets forth a program product including translating logic programmed to translate the overlapping local address from the inbound address domain into a unique global address that is specific to a specified outbound address domain. The

Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that Claim 22 and its dependent claims 23 – 31, 34 – 41, 43 – 48, and 51 – 55 are in condition for allowance for the same reasons as previously set forth for Claim 1 and its dependent claims.

The Applicant's independent Claim 56 sets forth a method in a communication system including a source host in a source (inbound) address domain communicating with a destination host in a destination (outbound) address domain by way of a network address translator, the method including the step of translating, by the network address translator, at least the source address from the source host local address to a unique source host global address that is specific to the destination (outbound) address domain. The Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that Claim 56 and its dependent claims 57 and 59 – 61 are in condition for allowance for the same reasons as previously set forth for Claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mary Steubing, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

1/27/2003  
Date

Mary Steubing  
Mary M. Steubing, Reg. No. 37,946  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
30 Nagog Park Drive  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 2204/116 120-045  
dd: 1/26/03